

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

### Amendment to the Specification

The typographical error “A/D” for “D/A” on page 4 has been updated to correctly match the context, digital to analog conversion (D/A).

### Claims Rejections 35 USC § 102

Claims 1 – 4, 14, 19 – 22, 24, 26, 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b), as being anticipated by Wheatley, III, et al. (US 5,107,225) (Wheatley).

Claim 1 (currently amended) recites elements not anticipated nor suggested in Wheatley. For examples, “the communication receiver comprising dual channels” and “each having a channel filter with a gain adjustable by said hardware” are not anticipated by Wheatley. Therefore, Claim 1 (currently amended) should be allowable over Wheatley.

Claim 4 is cancelled and the reason for rejection no longer applies.

Claims 2, 3, 5 and Claims 6 – 7, being dependent on Claim 1 (currently amended) which is believed allowable, should also be allowable for the at least same reasons cited above. Further, Claim 2 as amended, recites a TDMA receiver; whereas Wheatley has a CDMA system (Col. 2). And Wheatley does not anticipate example elements of Claims 5, 6 and 7 regarding the hardware, such as “responsive to said bias level information”, “difference circuitry” and “range checking”, respectively (Wheatley Fig. 1 element 24, Col. 4 lines 49 – 54).

Claim 19, as amended, which is the base claim for the objected-to Claim 25, now includes the limitations of Claim 25. As such, Claim 19 and Claims 20 – 24 which depend therefrom stand allowable. Claim 25 is cancelled.

Claim 26 (currently amended) recites the elements “adjusting filter gain settings” and “dual channels” not found in Wheatley. Therefore, Claim 26 (currently amended) should be allowable over Wheatley. Claims 27 – 29 being dependent on Claim 26 (currently amended) should be allowable for the at least same reasons cited for the base claim. The dependent claims also recite additional elements not anticipated by Wheatley, e.g. the LNA of Claim 29 and the response to a desired bias level of an amplifier of Claim 27.

#### Claims Rejections 35 USC § 103

Claims 5 – 7, 23, 27, 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wheatley in view of Suganuma et al. (U.S. 5,507,023) (Suganuma).

Claims 5 and 6 – 7, being dependent on an amended Claim 1, are believed to be also allowable for the at least same reasons for their base claim. Further, neither Wheatley nor Suganuma anticipates example elements of Claims 5, 6 and 7 regarding the hardware, such as “responsive to said bias level information”, “difference circuitry” and “range checking”, respectively. See (Wheatley Fig. 1 element 24, Col. 4 lines 49 – 54) and (Suganuma Fig. 4 element 17 and the references to 17 throughout Suganuma).

The base claim 19 for the dependent Claim 23 is currently amended and the reason for rejecting Claim 23 no longer applies.

The base claim 26 for the dependent Claims 27, 29 is currently amended and the reasons for 103 rejections no longer apply; neither Wheatley nor Suganuma, individually or together, anticipates the at least elements of their base claim. For example, the Suganuma (Fig. 4, element 13) filter does not have adjustable gain, and neither does Wheatley as noted above.

#### Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant thanks the Examiner for allowing 8 – 13, 15 – 18, 25 if re-written in independent form with the base claims and any intervening claims. Claims 8, 15 and 17 (currently amended) are thus re-written. Claims 9 – 14 dependent on Claim 8 (currently amended), and Claim 16 dependent on Claim 15 (currently amended), and Claim 17 dependent on Claim 17 (currently amended) should also be thus allowable.

Claim 19 (currently amended) is Claim 25 re-written per the Examiner's instructions. Claims 20 – 24, dependent on Claim 19 (currently amended) should also be thus allowable.

#### New Claims

New Claim 30 being dependent on Claim 26 (currently amended) which Applicant believes is allowable, should also be allowable over Wheatley. The dependent claim also recites additional elements not found in Wheatley, e.g. the TDMA system, cited on p. 1 of the specification.

Application No. 10/021,360  
Amendment dated August 29, 2006  
Response to Office Action of March 9, 2006

Respectful request is made for reconsideration of the application, as amended,  
and for an issuance of a Notice of Allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

/Ronald O. Neerings/  
Ronald O. Neerings  
Reg. No. 34,227  
Texas Instruments Incorporated  
PO Box 655474, M/S 3999  
Dallas, Texas 75265  
972.917.5299